

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 15 and 16 have been amended. Claims 1-16 are pending and under consideration.

Claims 2-16 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph for indefiniteness. The claims have been amended to address the rejection, and it is believed to be self-explanatory how this is done. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-16 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,502,984 to Ogura et al. ("Ogura et al. '984"). Claim 4 is separately rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Ogura et al. '984 and U.S. Patent No. 6,314,198 to Ogura ("Ogura '198").

In response to the previous Office Action, it was argued that the references cited by the Examiner do not suggest an image processing condition that corresponds to the photography device and the target/photography conditions. It is unclear why the Examiner has not allowed the claims. However, perhaps the Examiner feels that there is some sort of inherent correspondence between the image processing condition and the photography device and target/photography conditions. To address this presumed interpretation, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the image processing condition storing section stores image processing conditions that correspond respectively to various photography devices and targets. Independent claim 2 has been amended to recite that the image processing condition storing section stores image processing conditions that correspond respectively to various photography devices and photography conditions. Independent claims 15 and 16 contain similar, but somewhat different limitations.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites that the image processing section reads the image processing condition that corresponds to the photography device used to obtain the radiation image and the target from where the image was obtained. Independent claim 2 recites that the image processing section reads the image processing condition that corresponds to the photography device and the photography conditions used to obtain the image. Independent claims 15 and 16 contain different, but somewhat similar limitations.

Certainly, the Ogura references disclose some sort of image processing. However, the Ogura references contain no hint or suggestion to store a plurality of image processing conditions and to base the image processing on the image processing condition that corresponds with the image. If there is any question regarding the Ogura references or the

limitations of the independent claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. Otherwise, it is submitted that the prior art rejections should be withdrawn and that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 29 2005

By: Mark J. Henry  
Mark J. Henry  
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501